

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Donnie Wallace, #13297-058,

Petitioner,

-vs-

United States of America; and
Matthew B. Hamidullah,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 8:05-486-SB

ORDER

RECEIVED
USDC CLERK, CHARLESTON
2006 MAR 22 A 1

This matter is before the Court on the pro se Petitioner's request for writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. By local rule, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks for preliminary review.

After the Respondents filed a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, the Petitioner was advised of the obligation to respond. The Petitioner responded and filed a motion for summary judgment of his own.


On February 1, 2006, the Magistrate Judge issued a report analyzing the issues. It recommends that the Respondents' motion for summary judgment be granted and that the Petitioner's motion be denied. Attached to the report was a notice advising the parties that they had ten days in which to file specific, written objections. To date, no such objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, since objections were not

filed, there are no portions of the report and recommendation to which a de novo review must be conducted. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation is hereby adopted as the order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Respondents' motion for summary judgment is granted; the Petitioner's motion for summary judgment is denied; the Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied; and this action is ended.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Sol Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

March 20, 2006
Charleston, S.C.

